REMARKS

Claims 1-43 and 58-73 are pending. Claim 74 ahs been added. No claims have been cancelled or amended.

Office Action Incomplete

Applicant appreciates the examiner's comments and attention to this matter.. However, while claims 1-43 and 58-73 are currently pending in the application, the present Office Action nowhere address the following claims or their features:

Claims 12-25

Claims 28-41

Claims 62-66

Claims 68-69

Accordingly, Applicant submits the present Office Action is not complete as to all matters are required. (e.g., see MPEP 707).

It may be that the above claims are deemed to correspond to allowable subject matter and such a notice was inadvertently omitted from the Office Action. If this is the case, Applicant requests the examiner provide an indication to that effect. If the examiner wishes to provide a rejection of any of the above claims, a new non-final Office Action should then issue which provides Applicant a reasonable opportunity to respond.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7, 42, 43, 58, 59 and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,337,715 (hereinafter "Inagaki"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,590,644 (hereinafter "Matsakis"). Claims 5-11, 26-27, 59-61 and 70-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki, in view of Matsakis, and further in view of Program Guide for Digital Television ATSC Standard (hereinafter "ATSC"). Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki, in view of Matsakis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,133 (hereinafter "Hopkins"). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and requests reconsideration in view of the following comments.

Claim 1 recites a receiver for processing data, wherein said receiver comprises:

a front end configured to receive a broadcast signal including a format definition expressed in a Bachus Naur Form, wherein said format definition comprises a description of a grammar which defines a syntax of a target language; and
a generic data processing engine configured to:
receive said format definition;
receive additional data which conforms to the target language; and
process the additionally received data in accordance with the format definition.

In the present Office Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Inagaki in view of Matsakis. In the rejection, it is stated:

"Regarding claims 1 and 58, Inagaki teaches a receiver for processing data, where the receiver comprises: A front end configured to receive a broadcast signal including a format definition expressed in a text form where the format definition comprises a description of grammar which defines a syntax of a target language (fig.7+, col.1, lines 30-63 and col. 15, line 36-57) and A generic data processing engine (fig. 7), configured to: receive the format definition, receive additional data which conforms to the target language and process the additionally received data in accordance with the format definition (col.1, lines 30-63 and col. 15, line 36-57: the library has the decoding software for decoding the additional information), note that a header and data,

both of which creates the format definition, where the header identifies the name of the library and attributes in combination with the data reads on a format definition. lnagaki further discloses that it is possible to provide data as text. lnagaki is silent as to where the format definition is expressed in Backus Naur Form." (Office Action, para. 3).

However, Applicant does not agree that Inakagi discloses at least the features as suggested by the above highlighted portion of the Office Action comments. For ease of reference, the above cited portions of Inagaki are reproduced below.

"In a prior art broadcasting system, all sub-broadcasters produce and transmit programs of a common broadcasting format, i.e., a video transmission format, a video coding format, and so on, such as MPEG, over all channels, while the viewer receives and reproduces broadcast signals by exclusive hardware corresponding to the common broadcasting format. That is, in the conventional broadcasting system, as shown in FIG. 42, the exclusive hardware receives data of the MPEG format transmitted by the sub-broadcasters 201 via the broadcaster 202, and displays the data on a full screen of a TV set or the like. On the other hand, an improvement in performance of computers makes possible video signal processing, which could have been handled only with exclusive hardware, with software using general-purpose hardware. That is, signal processing with such software makes it possible to decode broadcast data of plural different broadcasting formats, if a decoding software program (library) for decoding each broadcast data is loaded in the general-purpose hardware. Thus, if broadcast data of plural different broadcasting formats can be decoded on the receiving side, broadcasting in which various broadcasting formats coexist, such as data broadcasting different from the conventional video/audio broadcasting, i.e., CG broadcasting and animation broadcasting, becomes possible. In such a broadcasting system, it is possible to provide such data as text and CG related to the conventional video, so a producer can create elaborate contents, and a viewer can receive various kinds of contents from a conventional service only for seeing to an interactive service. For example, as shown in FIG. 43, it is possible that plural data of different broadcasting formats coexisting in a channel are transmitted on the transmitting side, and plural contents of different broadcasting formats are displayed in a screen on the receiving side." (Inagaki, col. 1, lines 30-63).

In the above disclosure, simply states that if a suitable software program library for decoding a given signal is loaded in receiving hardware, then a corresponding

broadcasting format may be decoded. However, nowhere here is there any disclosure or suggestion of receiving a signal which includes a format definition that comprises a description of a grammar which defines a syntax of a target language. Even were one to accept the rejection's equating of a header and data as a format definition (which Applicant does not), there is still no disclosure of a format definition that comprises a description of a grammar which defines a syntax of a target language. A library configured to decode a particular type of signal is not equivalent to such features.

In addition to the above, FIG. 7 and the following from Inagaki are cited:

"FIG. 7 is a diagram showing a structure of a broadcasting reception apparatus in accordance with a second embodiment of this invention. In the figure, reference numeral 21 designates a library EPG receiver receiving a library EPG provided by a broadcaster; 22, a library EPG analyzer analyzing the library EPG received by the library EPG receiver 21, and controlling a library receiver described below, based on a result of the analysis; 23, a library receiver receiving libraries provided by the broadcaster; 24, a library buffer holding the libraries received by the library receiver 23; 25, a data receiver receiving broadcast signals of a program; and 26, a processing unit decoding the program signals received by the data receiver 25, using the library held by the library buffer 24. FIG. 8 is a diagram showing an example of a structure of a broadcast signal of a program provided by a broadcaster. As shown in FIG. 8, the broadcast signal comprises a data part 31 and a header part 32. In the header part 32, the name of a decoding software program (library) for decoding data in the data part 31, and attribute data, such as the display position and display size of the data, are described. That is, data A is decoded using a library A, and displayed at a position (Xl, Yl) on a screen, in a size (W1, Hl)." (Inagaki, col. 15, lines 35-57).

In the above disclosure, Inagaki generally describes the block diagram of FIG. 7 and again makes reference to decoding libraries. However, as discussed above, such libraries are not equivalent to the recited format definition that comprises a description of a grammar which defines a syntax of a target language. Therefore, while the present rejection suggests Inagaki discloses such features, Applicant submits Inagaki does not disclose such features. Neither does the remaining cited art disclose such features, and the

combination of cited art does not disclose all the features of claim 1. Claims 58, 70, 71, and 74 are similarly distinguishable.

In addition to the above, the proposed combination of Inagaki and Matsakis is not suggested by the cited art, and there is not perceived reason or benefit from making such a combination. Inagaki is directed to a system for improving a viewer's "zapping" experience. To that end, Inagaki describes a system whereby a viewer can tell whether a necessary decoding library is loaded. Additionally, Inagaki discloses that a library may be prefetched. Matsakis is directed to translating data from one format/protocol to another (e.g., "at the present time there are not many ways to produce a streaming XML transform."). There is nothing in Inagaki that suggests a need for such a translation. In any event, such a combination does not disclose all the features of the claims as discussed above.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5266-09300/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rory D. Rankin /
Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
   Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: July 9, 2010